13th August 1956]

UNSTARRED QUESTIONS.

Sale of handloom cloth in shandies and weekly markets

1 *Q.*—SRI A. RATNAM: Will the Hon. the Minister for Agriculture be pleased to state—

(*a*) the number of centres opened to sell handloom cloth in shandies, weekly markets, etc., through hawkers;

(*b*) the number of depots and emporia for the sale of handloom cloth in the City and in the State; and

(*c*) the nature of Government subsidy granted and the measures taken by the Government under the Pilot scheme to grant financial assistance?

A.—(*a*) Twelve weavers' co-operative societies, at the rate of one in each of the following twelve circles, in charge of Deputy Registrars of Co-operative Societies, are working the scheme for the sale of handloom cloth through hawkers:—

1 Chingleput.	7 Ramanathapuram.
2 Cuddalore.	8 Vellore (North)
3 Kumbakonam.	9 Salem.
4 Tiruchirappalli (North)	10 Erode.
5 Madurai.	11 Malabar (North)
6 Tirunelveli.	12 Coimbatore.

	Depots.	Emporia.	
(*b*) Madras City ..	7	9	As on 30th April 1956.
Madras State (excluding Madras City).	221	42	

(*c*) A scheme for the relief of weavers from indebtedness to master-weavers has been formulated so that they may become members of weavers' co-operatives. Under the scheme, loans will be granted to weavers to discharge their debts to master-weavers. The loans will be interest-free and will be repayable within a period of ten years, the first instalment being payable after two years of the drawal of the loan. On becoming members of co-operative societies, each of the weavers will be given a grant to provide himself with a loom. In the first instance, a limited number of weavers in each circle will be admitted to the benefit of the scheme, which will be implemented in the circles of Cuddalore, Salem, Madurai, Vellore (South), Mangalore and Malabar (North). The total cost of the scheme is estimated at Rs. 3,33,080 of which Rs. 2,72,600 will be loans and Rs. 60,480, grants. The scheme will be implemented on the allotment of funds for the purpose during 1956–57 by the Government of India, from the Cess Fund.

[13th August 1956

Educational institutions in the districts

2 *Q.*—SRI K. ARANGANATHAN: Will the Hon. the Minister for Finance be pleased to state the number of middle schools, high schools, arts colleges and professional colleges in the districts of the State in the school-year 1955–56?

A.—A statement[a] is laid on the table of the House.

Judicial Service Officers

3 *Q.*—SRI V. R. KRISHNA AYYAR: Will the Hon. the Minister for Finance be pleased to state the total number of Civil Judicial Officers and Subdivisional Magistrates and District Magistrates in the State and among them how many are Malayalees?

A.—A statement[b] is placed on the table of the House.

Civil Courts in Malabar

4 *Q.*—SRI V. R. KRISHNA AYYAR: Will the Hon. the Minister for Finance be pleased to state how many Munsifs' Courts and Sub-Courts existed in Malabar on 31st March 1956 and how many Courts have been sanctioned since and why?

A.—A statement[c] showing the District Munsifs' Courts and the Sub-Courts that existed in Malabar on 31st March 1956 and those that were sanctioned since that date together with the reasons therefor is placed on the table of the House.

Revenue received in certain Sub-Registrar's offices

5 *Q.*—SRI K. MADHAVAN NAMBIAR: Will the Hon. the Minister for Religious Endowments and Transport be pleased to state the revenue received from the following Sub-Registrars' offices for the financial year ending 31st March 1956: (1) Fort Cochin, (2) Uliyil and (3) Kumaranallur?

A.—The particulars are furnished below:—

Name of the office.	Revenue received during the financial year ending 31st March 1956.
	RS.
1 Fort Cochin	5,434
2 Uliyil	10,584
3 Kumaranallur	6,159

[a] Printed as Appendix I on page 593—infra.
[b] Printed as Appendix II on page 594 infra.
[c] Printed as Appendix III on pages 594–595 infra.

13th August 1956]

Lands in Vriddhachalam taluk

6 Q.—Sri M. KATTIMUTHU : Will the Hon. the Minister fo Revenue be pleased to state how many acres of patta lands, how many acres of waste lands and how many acres of forest lands are available in Vriddhachalam taluk of South Arcot district ?

A.—Patta lands—237,659 acres.

Waste lands—

(a) Assessed waste—37,409 acres.

(b) Unassessed waste—1,198 acres.

Forests—17,731 acres.

New schemes introduced in First Five-Year Plan in Vriddhachalam taluk

7 Q.—Sri M. KATTIMUTHU : Will the Hon. the Minister for Finance be pleased to state the improvements effected and the new schemes introduced by the Government in the First Five Year Plan in Vriddhachalam taluk in South Arcot district ?

A.—The First Five-Year Plan was drawn up taking into consideration the needs of the State as a whole. The Government have therefore not drawn up any special schemes for Vriddhachalam taluk or for any other taluk in particular.

[*Note*.—An asterisk (*) at the commencement of a speech indicates revision by the Member.]

II.—STATEMENT UNDER RULE 40 OF THE ASSEMBLY RULES *RE* HARDSHIP FELT BY STUDENTS OF PADAYACHI COMMUNITY.

Mr. SPEAKER : I have received notice under Rule 40 from Sri K. R. Viswanathan calling attention of the Hon. Minister for Finance and Education to a matter of urgent public importance, viz., the hardship felt by the students of the Padayachi community due to the withdrawal of the full-fee concession in schools given to them. Sri Viswanathan may explain his point. 10-10 a.m.

* Sri K. R. VISWANATHAN : Mr. Speaker, Sir, full-fee concession was granted under G.O. No. 1081, Education, dated 2nd August 1954 to the students of the Padayatchi community in the districts of Salem, Tiruchirappalli, Tanjore and South Arcot. This was because this community was included in the list of former criminal tribes circulated along with memorandum No. 34123-D/51/9, Education, dated 28th November 1952. Sir, it is a fact that at one time this community in the four districts was declared as 'a Criminal tribe' and that is why it finds a place in the list referred to by me. In answer to my question on the floor of the House, in July 1953, the then Minister for Law had categorically stated that this community was eligible for full fee concession. I would like to make it clear here that the concession was granted